DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 970 HE 022 273

AUTHOR Sabloff, Paula L. W.; Yeager, John L.
TITLE Building a Workable Academic Integrity System: Issues and Options.
PUB DATE 16 Feb 89
NOTE 33p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Administrators; *Codes of Ethics; College Administration; College Faculty; College Students; *Ethics; Guidelines; Higher Education; *Integrity; Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted of 55 American Association of Universities institutions regarding the guidelines, policies and procedures of their academic integrity systems. Forty-four universities responded, returning 42 questionnaires and 35 guidelines. Examination of the guidelines revealed very little overlap in procedures. Most institutions claimed that their procedures work effectively, but comments suggested some concern. Eleven questions are presented and discussed that will aid an institution in building an academic integrity system that fits its philosophy and mission: (1) What actions should be considered violations of academic integrity? Should academic dishonesty be considered separate from academic misconduct? What constitutes proof of a violation against the academic integrity code? (2) Should the university establish an Honor Code to cover some or all of the defined violations? (3) What are the rights, protections and responsibilities of the students? (4) What are the rights, protections and responsibilities of the faculty? (5) Should the same procedures be applied to undergraduates in all colleges, or should each college maintain its own procedures? (6) Should academic integrity violations be processed by an office of student affairs, or should such violations be the responsibility of an office of academic affairs? (7) What procedures should be established for deciding and appealing a violation against academic integrity? (8) What sanctions should be applied against violations of academic integrity? And should these sanctions correlate with the type of violation or should sanctions be imposed at the discretion of the person(s) responsible for imposing them? (9) How should records of violations be kept? (10) Which members of the university should revise the policy and procedures of the academic integrity system? (11) How should the policy and procedures concerning academic integrity be presented to students, faculty and administrators? Appendix A lists the responding universities, and a copy of the survey form is provided as Appendix B. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304970

BUILDING A WORKABLE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SYSTEM: ISSUES AND OPTIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paula L. Sabloff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paula L. W. Sabloff
John L. Yeager
Office of Management and Budget
University of Pittsburgh
February 16, 1989

HE 022 273

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

1.0 What actions should be considered violations of academic integrity? Should academic dishonesty be considered separate from academic misconduct? What constitutes proof of a violation against the academic integrity code? 3

2.0 Should the university establish an Honor Code to cover some or all of the defined violations? 7

3.0 What are the rights, protections, and responsibilities of the students? 8

4.0 What are the rights, protections, and responsibilities of the faculty? 10

5.0 Should the same procedures be applied to undergraduates in all colleges, or should each college maintain its own procedures? 12

6.0 Should academic integrity violations be processed by an office of student affairs, or should such violations be the responsibility of an office of academic affairs? 13

7.0 What procedures should be established for deciding and appealing a violation against academic integrity? 18

8.0 What sanctions should be applied against violations of academic integrity? And should these sanctions correlate with the type of violation or should sanctions be imposed at the discretion of the person(s) responsible for imposing them? 20

9.0 How should records of violations be kept? 23

10.0 Which members of the university should revise the policy and procedures of the academic integrity system? 24

11.0 How should the policy and procedures concerning academic integrity be presented to students, faculty, and administrators? 24

CONCLUSION 25

APPENDIX A 27

APPENDIX B 28

INTRODUCTION

A good academic integrity system of policy and procedures is one that:

-- Reflects the values of the university, i.e., sends a message to students, faculty, and administrators that the integrity of the university will be upheld in a manner that is just to all members of the academic community;

-- Uniformly applies sanctions to all students who have been proved to have violated the academic integrity of the university;

-- Does not use an excessive bureaucratic process that inflicts heavy paper work on the administration, faculty, and students; and

-- Is timely.

In order to ensure that the University of Pittsburgh College of Arts and Sciences academic integrity system meets the above criteria, a request for guidelines and a questionnaire was mailed to the other 55 American Association of Universities (AAU) institutions. Forty-four universities responded, returning 42 questionnaires and 35 guidelines (Appendix A).

Examination of the guidelines revealed very little overlap in procedures. The 13 universities that use the same reporting structure as the University of Pittsburgh (i.e., report violations to an academic office) even exhibit great variety in procedures, as will be seen in Figure 2. Because systemic analysis yielded little comparative information, comparisons of each facet of academic integrity policy and procedures were undertaken and reinforced by the data collected from the survey.

Most of the responding universities claim that their academic integrity procedures are working effectively (see Appendix B, question 10). Few have revised or are planning to revise the procedures in the near future (Appendix B, questions 4 and 5). Yet comments written at the end of the questionnaire suggest some concern about procedures. One person noted that the procedures do not stop or even lower the number of violations. (Reported violations ranged from 0 to 360 during the 1987-88 academic year according to the survey; the mean number of violations per institution is 33.5.)

Eight respondents wrote that the faculty do not use the procedures sufficiently.[1] Two administrators surmised that some faculty feel the procedures are too cumbersome and time-consuming. Thus they resolve a case themselves, and central administration never learns about the infractions. Administrators are concerned that under these circumstances, the sentencing and penalizing of students are not applied uniformly within the school and that repeat offenders are not caught.

---

[1] This is 19 percent of the survey group. If the 6 Honor Code universities are eliminated from the count, then 8 out of 38, or 22 percent, are concerned about faculty participation.

These problems can be resolved by building better procedures and policies concerning academic integrity. By addressing the issues presented in this report, a higher education institution can devise a system that is equitable and workable. It should be noted, however, that a workable system does not prevent violations of academic integrity, nor does it prevent people from doing 'end-runs' around the system , i.e., appealing to individuals not prescribed in the guidelines to resolve the case in their behalf.

By answering the questions that follow, an institution can build an academic integrity system that fits its philosophy and mission. The questions are presented in progressive order. That is, they follow an order that corresponds to the questions that an institution would have to answer in order to build an academic integrity system.

BUILDING A WORKABLE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SYSTEM:

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

1.0 **What actions should be considered violations of academic integrity? Should academic dishonesty be considered separate from academic misconduct? What constitutes proof of a violation against the academic integrity code?**

A model of academic integrity starts with definitions of the violations of academic integrity. The university guidelines reviewed vary from one-sentence statements to lengthy descriptions with examples. The categories and brief definitions described in the material sent by the AAU institutions are found in Figure 1 (pages 3-5).

Some universities distinguish between 'academic dishonesty' and 'academic misconduct,' with the former defined as various forms of cheating and plagiarism and the latter defined as forms of disruptive behavior that affect the academic setting. Academic misconduct has been included in Figure 1 (page 5) because some universities merge it with academic dishonesty.

One university distinguishes between 'academic negligence' and 'academic dishonesty.' The former is defined as an act which would appear to be academic dishonesty but was not motivated by an intent to mislead, deceive, or defraud. Negligence is not equated with ignorance; the student is still responsible for learning the rules.

Another university states that faculty may also be charged with 'academic dishonesty.' In this case, the term is defined as "grading work by criteria other than academic performance, or repeated and willful neglect in the discharge of duly assigned teaching duties."

Few guidelines describe what constitutes proof of academic dishonesty[2]. A few give examples of actual cases of academic dishonesty. However, the cases are not exhaustive descriptions of what kinds of proof have been accepted by judicial personnel or boards. A few give examples of actual cases of academic dishonesty. However, the cases are not exhaustive descriptions of what kinds of proof have been accepted by judicial personnel or boards, but it is clear that faculty and students would benefit from examples or some descriptive information.

---

[2] A few give examples of actual cases of academic dishonesty. However, the cases are not exhaustive descriptions of what kinds of proof have been accepted by judicial personnel or boards at the universities.

FIGURE 1

CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

ACCORDING TO THE AAU INSTITUTIONS[3]

VIOLATIONS OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

In Examinations

Using "crib sheets" or other unauthorized materials

Having someone other than the student take his/her exam

Copying from another student's exam paper

Giving unauthorized assistance to another student taking an exam

Theft or unauthorized access to an exam previous to its administration

Informing another of questions on an exam in the same academic term (semester)

Revising and submitting a quiz for regrading without the instructor's knowledge and consent

In a take-home exam, collaborating with other students or unauthorized persons (including other instructors) to obtain answers

On Papers and Other Graded Assignments (including art work, computer assignments, etc.)

Having someone other than the student write the paper [treated as a form of plagiarism by some institutions]

Plagiarism (insufficient or improper acknowledgement of someone else's written work in one's own writing):

Word-for-word plagiarism

Section-by-section plagiarism

Select-term or key phrase plagiarism

Paraphrasing

---

[3] Because the categories come from several institutions, they are not mutually exclusive.

A proof (scientific or mathematical)

A graphic element

Submitting a paper written by someone else: a service, friend or from fraternity/sorority files

Receiving unauthorized help in writing the paper, or not giving credit to another for his/her contributions

Unauthorized collaboration on an assignment (collusion)

Giving unauthorized assistance to another student writing a paper

Using unauthorized material in the preparation of an assignment

Lying to an instructor to increase the grade

Using the same written material for two courses without explicit permission from both instructors

In Research

Fabricating data in support of laboratory or field work

Falsifying data in support of laboratory or field work

Sabotaging another student's research

Stealing another student's research ideas

Taking credit for work not done by oneself

Hoarding materials/equipment to advance one's research at the expense of others

Deliberate destruction, theft, or unauthorized use of laboratory data, research materials (including laboratory animals), or computer resources

In the Library

Stealing materials from the library

Not returning materials promptly when asked to do so

Hoarding scarce copies of materials needed by others

Deliberately damaging library materials

Helping other students steal, hoard, or damage library materials

Duplicating copyrighted material unlawfully (library materials, computer software, etc.)

In Academic Records

Changing a grade on a student's record (changing a transcript)

Forging signatures on petitions to add/drop a course after the final date

Forging signatures on certifications of completed course work (modifying academic records to obtain additional credit)

Willful misrepresentation of a student's status, support, sponsorship or activities, including the acquisition of degrees, awards, honors, certificates, or professional endorsement

Falsifying letters of recommendation to graduate schools

Miscellaneous

Bribing another to gain an academic advantage

Academic Misconduct

Talking during an exam

Bringing unauthorized materials into the exam room

Disruptive behavior in the classroom

Interference with access to or egress from classrooms, computers, laboratories, etc.

Actual or threatened violence against or harassment of a student, instructor, University staff member or administrator

Defacing or damaging academic facilities or materials

2.0 **Should the university establish an Honor Code to cover some or all of the defined violations?**

An Honor Code is a written statement that students sign upon matriculating. A typical Honor Code defines violations of academic integrity (cheating, plagiarism) and makes students responsible for not breaking the code themselves and for taking an active part in enforcing the code (i.e., turning in those they catch breaking the code).

In addition to signing the Honor Code, students are often required to write at the top of their examinations and graded class work (papers, shorter assignments, etc.) that they did not break the code in preparing the work submitted. One university has the students write and sign each assignment: "I pledge my honor that I have not violated the Honor Code during this examination."

Universities with an Honor Code place responsibility for enforcement on the students themselves; faculty are relieved of the responsibility of proctoring exams or gathering evidence against a student who is suspected of violating the code. Violations are prosecuted by hearing boards that consist of all, or mostly, students. In one institution, students have the authority to expel a fellow student.

Only 6 of the 44 universities have an Honor Code, although three administrators write that they would like to institute one and one public research university is phasing one in now. The 6 Honor Code universities were all established before 1900, and 4 of the 6 instituted the Honor Code before this century. The other 2 established the Honor Code before 1925. With the exception of Stanford, the universities with honor codes cluster in or near the southeast part of the United States. Four of the six are private institutions.

Honor Codes are not found in urban, public research institutions. One public research university abandoned its Honor Code in 1974 because, the administrator writes, it did not work in large classes. Another public research university notes that one of the professional schools has an Honor Code, but the undergraduate component does not. However, one public research university is in the process of phasing in an honor Code.

The surveys and anecdotal evidence suggest that an Honor Code is an effective means for handling cases of academic dishonesty, even though it does not seem to deter such dishonesty more successfully than other procedures. While the sample of 35 guidelines is too small for statistical analysis, it is significant that only one of the 6 universities with an Honor Code had revised the code or procedures in academic year 1987-88, and none were planning to do so in the coming year. On the other hand, 9 of the 27 universities that do not use an Honor Code had recently revised, are planning to revise, or are beginning to review their academic integrity policies and procedures for possible revision.

3.0 **What are the rights, protections, and responsibilities of the students?**

Examination of the 35 guidelines reveals 12 students' rights issues that policy on academic integrity needs to address. Responsibilities vary according to whether or not the university has an Honor Code.

3.1 Rights and Protections:

The guidelines protect students' rights in the following ways:

3.1.1 Due process: Sixteen of the 35 universities include a statement in the guidelines that the student is innocent until proven guilty and that the burden of proof is on the side of the university. Thus the alleged offender need only convince the hearing board that there is insufficient evidence in order to have the charges dropped and the student declared innocent. The inclusion of a statement on due process is a good idea as the student is guaranteed this right in federal court cases.

3.1.2 Student's choice of procedure: The student often has a choice of how to proceed. The first choice entails agreeing to the charges and thus resolving the case at the lowest possible administrative level. In some universities, this may mean that the student agrees to the charges made by the faculty member and accepts the sanction meted out by the faculty (perhaps a lowered or failing grade in the course or the assignment and notification of the violation of academic integrity to the dean). In other universities, the student may opt to have the dean (or his/her representative) mediate or take the case immediately to a hearing board. If a faculty member refuses to bring the charges before a hearing board, the student has the right to request a hearing him/herself. Options are illustrated in Figure 2 (page 14).

3.1.3 Notification of actions: Five institutions require that the student be notified of any actions (including the original charge) by certified mail. This protects the student's right to procedural due process.

Whereas most universities do not notify parents, a few do. One notifies the parents of the accusation; one welcomes them to the hearing; and three report the decision of the hearing board to the parents.

3.1.4 Witnesses at informal meetings: If the student meets with the faculty member under whose jurisdiction the violation allegedly took place, 10 universities require that the student, the faculty member, or both bring a witness.

3.1.5 Student's defense: Twenty-four universities allow the student to bring witnesses to the hearing and grant the student permission to cross-examine witnesses brought by the prosecution. Ten of the 24 universities also give the student permission to review in advance all documents that will be used as evidence. The student may also act as his/her own witness, introduce other evidence, or rebut the findings of those who sit in judgement.

3.1.6 Legal counsel: Ten universities expressly forbid legal counsel

for either the student or the complainant, stating that academic dishonesty is not a criminal act but an act against the academic community that should be resolved within the community. Twelve universities permit the presence of a lawyer. Of the latter, 3 universities limit the lawyer's participation to advising the student at the hearing while others permit the attorney to cross-examine witnesses and represent the student. A few of the 12 universities allow the student to bring legal counsel if the student notifies the hearing board several days before the hearing so that the university may also bring an attorney. If the student is not bringing a lawyer, the university does not bring one either.

3.1.7 Student's presence at a hearing: To protect the rights of the accused student and allow due process, most universities require the student's presence at the hearing. One fines the student and five cancel the hearing if the student does not attend. But many universities proceed without the student, stating that the student had the opportunity to change the date of the hearing if she/he so desired.

3.1.8 Adviser: The universities that forbid the student from using a lawyer usually suggest someone within the institution who can provide advice. Often it is the responsibility of the dean to advise the student of the procedures and of the people who can help. At some of the universities that maintain an Honor Code, students advise and support the accused.

3.1.9 Right to appeal: Every university guideline offers the student the right to appeal the decision of a faculty member, dean, or hearing board to a higher authority. Three guidelines warn the student that an appeal may result in an increased penalty; the others do not.

3.1.10 Scholastic rights: A few universities protect the student from potentially losing credit in course work. One "freezes" the student's status when a claim is filed. The student is expected to continue in school, attending all courses, until a decision is reached. Another university requires that when a faculty member suspects a student of violating academic integrity, the faculty member should assign a temporary grade to the work. The grade reflects the instructor's assessment of the assignment had a violation not been suspected. Then if the student is found innocent, a fair grade has already been established.

Many universities empower the dean to temporarily suspend the student from the university if the dean determines that the student's presence would be harmful either to the student or to the university. In this case, the dean's decision overrides the student's right to remain in class.

3.1.11 Confidentiality: All universities treat the investigation of an academic violation as confidential. One university with an Honor Code even maintains the anonymity of the accuser at the hearing if s/he so desires. Another university guarantees privacy to any witness upon that person's request. Most universities do not go this far but remind witnesses, those on the hearing board, and those otherwise involved in the case to respect the confidentiality of the person accused. In all cases, the hearing board deliberates in private.

Confidentiality is extended to the records of the case. Twenty-three out of 42 universities (54 percent) report on the questionnaire that student records are kept confidential within the school or department; 13 report that they are not; and 6 did not respond. One university keeps these records, inking out the names, so that the case can be used as precedent for other cases. Thirty-two out of 42 report that student records are shared within the university when necessary; 8 write that they are not shared; and 2 checked both options. Thus it appears that whether or not records are shared depends on the judgement of the person, usually a dean, whose office keeps the records.

3.1.12 Timeliness: Many guidelines include the statement that the procedures should take as little time as possible; resolution within the same semester is encouraged. If the offense occurs at the end of a semester, the procedures should be completed before the end of the following semester. Twenty-four institutions often put a time limit on every step of the procedure (often measured in 24-hour increments), thus forcing the participants to move swiftly.

The time limits are lengthened by the necessities of due process. For example, students, faculty, and administrators must have time to prepare for a hearing, think about their decisions (e.g., whether or not to appeal the case), and receive notification. It appears that whenever the universities must choose between swift justice and due process, the universities opt for due process.

3.2 Responsibilities:

Students are responsible for learning the university's standards of academic integrity. In Honor Code universities, the students sign a pledge upon matriculation. Some have the student write and sign at the top of each assignment (paper or exam) that they have abided by the Honor Code on the assignment handed in.

Universities that do not have an Honor Code vary in the degree of responsibility assigned to students. Most university guidelines give full responsibility to the student. However, they often require the instructor to specify the parameters of academic honesty at the beginning of each course. In fact, it is often difficult to distinguish between the responsibility of the faculty member and of the student.

4.0 What are the rights, protections, and responsibilities of the faculty?

4.1 Rights and Protections: The guidelines include information on faculty responsibility, authority, participation, and advice. However, the only rights found in some of the guidelines are: the right to appeal a decision; the right to bring an adviser to a hearing; and the right to an "expeditious hearing" (i.e., the right to call witnesses and to receive a decision and the rationale for that decision). Only one university states that faculty rights take precedence over student rights.

4.1.1 Lawsuit support: Although many of the guidelines are organized in

constitutional or strict outline form, not one sets forth the university's policy on defending its faculty under such situations. Yet it can be assumed that, like the University of Pittsburgh, all AAU universities have such an indemnification policy.

4.1.2 Faculty authority: Levels of faculty authority vary among the universities. Some give faculty the authority to meet with the student in an attempt to resolve the problem before bringing it to a higher level. In these universities, the maximum penalty that an instructor may impose is a failing grade for the assignment or the course. Other universities instruct the faculty member to inform the authority as soon as s/he suspects a student of violating the rules. If the authority is a hearing board, the faculty member sometimes acts as a witness rather than the person responsible for determining the facts of the case. If the authority is a dean, the faculty member may act as the person who proves the student's guilt.

4.1.3 Faculty participation: Faculty participation varies from total control (penalizing the student and notifying the administration) to total lack of control.

Universities with an Honor Code usually turn over the entire process to the students. Students investigate the charge, counsel the accused, hold a hearing at which the faculty member may act as witness, and sentence or recommend a sanction to the administration. Sometimes a faculty representative or a few faculty sit on the hearing board. Usually the faculty play no role whatsoever in the decision-making process.

Universities without an Honor Code assign the faculty different responsibilities. Some encourage the faculty member to resolve the situation with the student before the problem goes to the dean or a hearing board. Others require the faculty member to report his/her suspicions to the appropriate administrative unit (dean, investigative committee, hearing board, or other official). Universities that report academic integrity violations through the Office of Student Affairs rather than through the academic side of the university usually favor the latter approach. Still other universities recommend that the faculty member meet with the dean and the student to resolve the issue.

At a formal hearing, the faculty member may present the case to the board, calling witnesses if relevant. In other universities, the faculty member may act as witness while an official presents the case.

In 21 universities (17 regular and 4 Honor Code institutions), faculty sit on hearing boards. They form the majority of members of the board at 6, the minority (see section 7.5 below.) at 6, and a balance with student representatives at 12 universities.

4.1.5 Guidance for faculty: All the guidelines indicate that confidentiality for the accused student must be strictly observed; students should not lose face for a charge that may be withdrawn or resolved in their favor. Thus faculty as well as administrators and other students must not discuss the case with their colleagues. Yet faculty need advice on how to proceed when

academic dishonesty is suspected. To whom can the faculty member turn? One university instructs the faculty member to consult with his/her department chairperson, who knows university policy and procedures. Another university assigns a judicial adviser, a law student who is capable of giving legal advice to the faculty member (perhaps to avoid a future lawsuit). Yet another recommends that the faculty consult a staff member. Material from other universities does not recommend a procedure to help the faculty member, mainly because the respondents sent student guidelines rather than faculty guidelines. Still, implied in the guidelines is the idea that the dean should counsel both the student and the instructor.

Few of the guidelines spell out what constitutes proof of an academic violation. A few examples are sometimes given, but they are not comprehensive.

4.2 Responsibilities: Faculty responsibilities vary by institution. The major ones are as follows:

4.2.1 Inform students: In three universities, faculty have the responsibility to inform students of the academic integrity rules at the beginning of each course. This might mean that if the instructor does not remind the student of the rules, the accused student can plead ignorance. A few universities make either the department or a special committee responsible for distributing standards of academic integrity.

4.2.2 Confidentiality of student: Faculty have the responsibility to protect the students' right to privacy. Confidentiality must be maintained in a case; hence the faculty member may not turn to colleagues for advice or help.

4.2.3 Notification of student: Seventeen universities make the faculty responsible for notifying the student of any accusation or any action taken in a case of suspected violation.

4.2.4 Prevent Cheating: Faculty are responsible for avoiding academic procedures that create temptations for students to violate academic integrity.

4.2.5 Report misconduct: Faculty are responsible for reporting any misconduct on the part of students to the proper authority. Such reports vary from suspicions of misconduct to actions already taken.

5.0 **Should the same procedures be applied to undergraduates in all colleges, or should each college maintain its own procedures?**

The survey shows that 32 of the 42 universities (74 percent) that returned the survey use the same procedures and reporting structure for all undergraduates, if not the total student population. Seven respondents maintain separate systems for students in the different colleges of the university. Three did not answer the question. Whether or not a university funnels all complaints through the same system affects the reporting structure used. For example, the procedures cannot be supervised by a dean of students or a dean of an undergraduate college if the graduate and professional students use it also.

6.0 **Should academic integrity violations be processed by an office of student affairs, or should such violations be the responsibility of an office of academic affairs?**

6.1 Responsibility: How the university assigns responsibility for investigating violations of academic integrity reflects the philosophy of the institution and has consequences for the academic integrity system. Those institutions that assign responsibility to an office of student affairs treat the student as a whole, or a system. Thus student housing, government, and activities are treated in the same office as infractions of student behavior such as demonstrations, wrecking buildings, and academic dishonesty. A student's record would reflect his/her academic and non-academic behavior. Under this system, the academic endeavors of faculty and research associates are separated from the academic efforts of students.

Another reporting structure for processing cases of academic dishonesty is through an office of academic affairs. Under this system, academic infractions become the responsibility of the academic structure of the institution while other forms of student misconduct are processed through an office of student affairs.[4] While the student appears fractionated, the main mission of the university, teaching and learning, remains intact.

---

[4] One institution even groups student and faculty academic dishonesty under the same set of guidelines.

A matrix of the 37 universities whose guidelines provided sufficient information for analysis illustrates the relationship between the reporting structure and the assignment of academic integrity procedures in that structure. Over half (19) report to an office of academic rather than student affairs (from the dean to the provost level).

Most Universities Use a University-wide System for Undergraduate Academic Integrity; Over Half Report to the Office of Academic Affairs

	All undergraduates report through same structure	Undergraduates report through various schools or colleges
Academic integrity system under the jurisdiction of an office of student affairs	14	1
System under the jurisdiction of an office of academic affairs	15	4
System under the jurisdiction of the president of the university	3	0
Total	32	5

6.2 Reporting structures: Fifteen universities process all undergraduate academic dishonesty cases through an office of academic affairs. Of those, 13 do not have an Honor Code. Yet they exhibit great variation in procedures of these structures. The various procedures of these institutions are presented in flow chart format in Figure 2, pages 15-17, so that the reporting structure may be seen.

Figure 2

REPORTING STRUCTURE[3]

FOR THE 13 UNIVERSITIES THAT PROCESS ACADEMIC INTEGRITY VIOLATIONS

THROUGH THE ACADEMIC SIDE OF THE UNIVERSITY[4]

1) **Decision:** faculty member --> department chairperson --> panel selected from the larger the judiciary committee becomes hearing board

   Appeal: provost

2) **Decision:** complaint by faculty or student --> dean --> college hearing board --> dean for implementation

   Appeal: dean --> rehearing by hearing board or appeals committee within the college

3) **Decision:** complaint (faculty/student) --> office of academic affairs (dean level) --> panel selected from a larger judiciary committee becomes hearing board

   Appeal: judiciary committee or an appeal board within the college

4) **Decision:** faculty member

   Appeal: faculty member or department chairperson --> dean of the college --> college appeals board --> university-wide hearing board

5) **Decision:** faculty --> department chairperson --> college hearing board --> dean for implementation

   Appeal: dean --> rehearing by hearing board
   or
   office of the provost
   or (in special cases)
   university-wide review board --> provost

---

[3] Underlined persons/units have the right to make decisions; units not underlined administer the decision.

[4] Those universities that do not have an Honor Code.

6) **Decision:** faculty member; informs dean of the college
or
faculty --> college hearing board (chaired by the dean)

Appeal: college hearing board
or
president of the university

7) **Decision:** faculty member; informs college hearing board

Appeal: college hearing board

or

Decision: faculty --> panel of the college judiciary committee becomes hearing board

Appeal: university coordinator --> university hearing board --> president's hearing board
or
university coordinator --> president's hearing board --> president

8) **Decision:** faculty member or academic department

Appeal: dean of the college --> university hearing board

9) **Decision:** faculty member

Appeal: college hearing board

or
Decision: faculty --> college hearing board --> university judicial board

Appeal: university judicial board

10) **Decision:** faculty member or department; informs dean
or
faculty or department--> dean --> office of the provost

Appeal: office of the provost

11) **First offense:**

Decision: faculty member with director of undergraduate studies; informs department chair and dean for implementation

Appeal: by department to dean if more severe punishment is warranted

Second/multiple offense:

Decision: faculty/complainant --> dean (with the recommendation of an ad hoc committee appointed by the dean)

Appeal: dean --> panel of the college hearing board investigates; another panel hears the case --> dean --> ad hoc committee

12) **Decision:** faculty with a witness (appointed by department chairperson or hearing board chairperson); informs college hearing board

Appeal: college hearing board

or

Decision: faculty or dean --> college hearing board --> dean for implementation

Appeal: dean

13) **Decision:** faculty member

Appeal: judicial administrator --> panel of the judiciary committee becomes the hearing board

or

Decision: faculty --> judicial administrator --> college hearing board --> dean for implementation

Appeal: executive committee of the college hearing board

7.0 **What procedures should be established for deciding and appealing a violation against academic integrity?**

Procedures covary with the type of reporting structure and policies established. Yet variety may be found among universities that use the same reporting structure. Within the group of universities that report violations of academic integrity to an office of academic affairs, variations on certain issues emerge. The issues include: the type of involvement expected of the faculty, departments, and dean; the role of the dean; the appeal process; the administrative unit responsible for checking the alleged violation; the composition of the hearing board; and the type of decision method used.

7.1 Involvement of faculty, departments, dean: The procedures found in the guidelines of the 13 universities described in Figure 2 illustrate some common themes:

-- 8 of the 13 universities authorize the faculty to resolve the issue with the student. Seven of the 8 explicitly state that the faculty member should inform the administrator (usually the dean) or hearing board of any action taken so that repeat offenders may be caught.

-- 6 of the 13 involve the academic department in some capacity, either as a decision-maker, as a check on the faculty member's decision, or as a conduit to the next level of administration.

-- 3 out of 13 give the dean the authority to resolve a case informally (either through mediation or judging the case or both) before going to a formal hearing board.

While most universities maintain the authority of the faculty member--who has the right to decide the course grade for the student --, less than half use the faculty member's department or the college dean to resolve the case on an informal basis.

7.2 Role of the dean: The role of the dean varies among the institutions:

-- 8 of the 13 universities use the dean's office to administer the procedure, but a hearing board decides the case. One of the 8 authorizes the dean to chair the hearing board.

-- None of the 13 universities authorizes the dean to prove the guilt of the student in a hearing (although one university not included among the 13 analyzed does).

-- 2 of the 13 universities authorize the dean to settle an appeal. Five other universities have the student or faculty member deliver the appeal to the dean, but the dean does not have the authority to make a decision concerning the appeal. The information from one university is unclear.

-- 3 of the 13 universities give the dean both the authority to resolve a case (either the original decision or an appeal) and the responsibility to administer the case.

7.3 Appeal process: Theoretically, a case may be appealed through channels until the president of the institution has the final word. However, most institutions try to resolve a case before bringing it to that administrative level. Six universities specify only one appeal (and one university even limits the student to one appeal); six universities outline a process that includes two or more alternative appeal procedures; and two universities[5] allow the student to appeal to two or more individuals or boards if they do not receive satisfaction at the previous appeal. Three universities allow both alternative and multiple appeals.

The basis for appeal varies. Whereas some universities permit the student to appeal on several grounds -- clemency, new information, lack of due process, etc. --, others limit the appeal for the latter two reasons.

7.4 Responsible college: When the student violates academic integrity in a course outside the college in which s/he has matriculated, the dean or hearing board responsible for adjudicating the case may vary:

1 university uses the student's college

7 use the college in which the course was taught

3 use a board that covers all undergraduates

2 lack sufficient information to categorize

The figures show that most universities treat the offense as an academic issue and the dean or hearing board as upholders of academic integrity.

7.5 Composition of the hearing board: Of the universities that have hearing boards, faculty form the majority in three; equal numbers of faculty and students are represented in three; and one university has an equal number of faculty and students but specifies that the quorum must have a majority of students.

Two universities have appeals boards but not hearing boards. One includes a majority of faculty, and the other stipulates a majority of students.

One university does not use hearing or appeals boards. Two universities did not provide sufficient information to be included in this count.

7.6 Majority vote: All of the hearing boards in the larger survey (35 guidelines) use majority vote; consensus building is not used.

---

[5] The number of universities adds up to 14 here because one university has two processes: one for the first offense and one for multiple offenses.

8.0 What sanctions should be applied against violations of academic integrity? And should these sanctions correlate with the type of violation or should sanctions be imposed at the discretion of the person(s) responsible for imposing them?

Figure 3 is a list of sanctions found in the guidelines of the 35 responding universities. The sanctions range from a maximum penalty that would revoke a degree already granted or that would expel the student to a minimum penalty that would give the student a warning.

Few universities correlate a particular sanction with a definite violation of academic integrity. Rather, they leave the imposition of the penalty to the individual(s) who have the responsibility to sentence the student. It is more common to impose a harsher penalty when the student is found guilty of multiple offenses than it is to require the same penalty for a particular offense.

A few universities impose a minimum penalty for violations of academic integrity; others impose a maximum penalty. For example, the maximum penalty that faculty are permitted to give is a failing grade in the course. Should the faculty feel that a more severe punishment is warranted, they must submit the case to a higher authority.

Often the hearing board imposes the sanction on the guilty student. In a few universities, the hearing board recommends a penalty to an administrator. In one university, a severe penalty (suspension or expulsion) may be recommended by an administrator or hearing board but must be reviewed by a higher administrator.

FIGURE 3

SANCTIONS USED BY THE AAU INSTITUTIONS

FROM MOST SEVERE TO MOST LENIENT[6]

Revocation of a degree previously awarded[7]

Withhold a degree (for seniors only)

Expulsion: permanent dismissal from the university

Suspension from the university

> Indefinite suspension: Reinstatement is contingent upon meeting the (written) requirements of the authority that imposed the sanction.
>
> Defined suspension: Suspension cannot be less than the remainder of the semester in progress or the next full semester.
>
> Definite suspension: For one or more terms.
>
> Deferred suspension: Suspension is deferred subject to a period of observation and review. If a student is found guilty of further violation, s/he will be suspended immediately.
>
> Emergency suspension: Pending final action on the violation, a student may be suspended for the safety of the university or of the student.
>
> Probated suspension: Conditional continuation of student status for a defined period of time.

Probation

> Disciplinary probation for a specific period of time: A period of review and observation during which the student must demonstrate the ability to comply with university rules, regulations, etc. It may include exclusion from certain extra-curricular activities for a set period of time, e.g., the student may not hold office or represent the University in any capacity.

---

[6] These sanctions were taken from all universities that sent guidelines, including those universities that process violations through an office of student affairs. Therefore, it is possible that some of the sanctions listed seem peripheral to academic integrity violations. Again, the categories are not mutually exclusive as they are taken from many universities.

[7] One university states that there is no termination date on this possibility.

Academic probation: A student's performance must be reviewed regularly by the Dean.

Warning probation: A probation for a fixed period of time that informs the student that further violations of regulations will result in more severe disciplinary action.

Reduction in the student's grade for the course

Grade of "No Credit," "Fail," or a lowered grade for the course

Reduction in grade on the assignment

From "Fail" to lowering of the grade on the assignment

Imposition of extra credit hours for graduation

Warning: Oral or written statement that continuation or repetition of violations of academic integrity will result in a more severe sanction.

Reprimand

Disciplinary reprimand, or censure: Official written notice to the student that his/her conduct is in violation of university rules and regulations.

Admonition: Oral statement that the student's action constitutes academic misconduct.

Restitution: Student is assessed the repair/replacement cost for any damage caused to property.

Negotiated Sanction: Student may be required to provide a specific service or participate in a specific program in lieu of or in addition to probation or suspension. One university requires the student to take a special writing course that teaches him/her how to avoid plagiarism.

Notation of the violation of the academic integrity code: marked on the student's record. It may be temporary or permanent.

Make-up assignment: The faculty member may give the student the opportunity to clear his/her name by doing an extra assignment.

Miscellaneous as determined by the faculty or the Committee

9.0 **How should records of violations be kept?**

The treatment of records of violation reflects the reporting structure as well as the philosophy of the university. Issues include the location and content of files, access to the files, and length of time records are kept.

9.1 Location of files: In 12 of the 35 universities, the Office of Student Affairs or Office of the Dean of Students maintains the records once the case has been closed. In 5 universities, the Office of Academic Affairs (dean or provost level) holds the records. In 8 other universities, the judicial committee maintains the records. The most unusual primary record keeper used is the chair of the academic department in which the violation occurred.

9.2 Contents of files: Files most often contain all of the material collected, including documentation of appeals. Other material in the file might include correspondence, evidentiary material, tape recordings of the hearing, written summaries, determination and disposition of the case, recommendations of sanctions, and sanctions imposed and served.

If a student is found innocent or a case is dismissed, a few universities specify that no report is kept of the action. However, the great majority of universities keep all records, no matter what the outcome.

If the student has been proven guilty, most universities do not place a notation of punishment on the student's permanent transcript. However, a small number of universities do, most often in the case of serious or repeat offenses. Usually the note is removed after fulfillment of the sanction, after petition by the student, or as determined by the sentencing authorities. One school assigns a unique letter grade (such as XF) on the permanent transcript, signifying "failure due to academic dishonesty." If the student successfully petitions to remove the note, the grade is changed. In another institution, a permanent note is made on the transcript if the student is forced to temporarily withdraw from school or is expelled.

9.3 Access to the files: According to the survey, 54 percent of the respondents write that the files are "confidential within a school or department," while 76 percent report that the files are "shared within the university when necessary." While these figures may appear contradictory, it is conceivable that administrators who had marked strict confidentiality on one question realize that exceptions do occur.

Twelve guidelines report that extra copies of the decision are sent to other administrative officers or faculty, such as the dean of the school in which the original incident occurred, the parties involved in the hearing, the hearing committee, the dean of the student's college, and/or the faculty member who initiated the action.

9.4 Length of time records are kept: According to the survey results, 54 percent of the universities do not destroy the files "when the student leaves the university," 31 percent destroy the files when the student leaves, and the rest did not answer or gave contradictory answers. Of those that keep the

files after the student leaves, 14 keep the files indefinitely, and an equal number keep them up to 15 years after graduation, with a mean of 6.3 years. Two universities determine how long to keep the records on a case-by-case basis.

10.0 **Which members of the university should revise the policy and procedures of the academic integrity system?**

According to the survey, 91 percent of the universities involve both faculty and students in modifying academic integrity procedures. Slightly less (81 percent) note that academic administrators assist in formulating academic integrity policy, while 71 percent report that other administrators have some input. University legal staff are involved in academic integrity procedures in 70 percent of the universities, and 60 percent of the universities involve the provost or academic vice president. Thirty-six percent state that the president helps to set academic integrity policy, while 19 percent of the respondents involve university trustees in the revision process.

11.0 **How should the policy and procedures concerning academic integrity be presented to students, faculty, and administrators?**

Of the material sent regarding academic integrity standards, 65 percent are pamphlets on academic integrity or sections of rules and regulations books, the majority of which addressed faculty as well as students. Thirty percent of the material sent are student guidelines or bulletins, while 5 percent are sections from unnamed or other sources.

The first group of material is often confusing, including great detail and often referring the reader from one section to another with no continuity, i.e., once the reader reaches Section 2.1.3, s/he is referred to Section 1.5.2 and then 4.3.1. But how do all of these fit together into one process? Only one university provides a flow chart to guide the reader through the maze of alternatives in the text.

Those universities that report academic integrity violations through an office of student affairs rather than an academic office usually list academic misdemeanors with non-academic ones. If the universities use separate processes for adjudication, the reader may study an entire procedure without realizing that it does not apply to academic dishonesty cases.

The literature directed toward students is more readable than the rules and regulations described above. Academic standards are usually placed in self-contained sections, written in everyday language, and are sometimes accompanied by examples. Clear explanations of the philosophy and purpose of academic integrity and of the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty toward academic integrity are described. About half of the student handbooks include details on procedure.

One university uses a glossy one-page brochure to explain academic integrity standards, supplementing that with a more detailed student handbook. A couple of universities provide specific examples of violations of academic integrity, and one describes methods for avoiding violations, such as proper

footnoting to guard against plagiarism. Three or four institutions disperse thought-provoking quotations of famous individuals on honesty and conscience throughout the text.

One university sent an excellent handbook on academic integrity for faculty. It includes the definitions of violations as well as students' and faculties' rights, responsibilities, and protections. It also gives practical advice on applying the standards, samples of correspondence, and a flow-chart to illustrate procedure.

The shortcomings of material received, as well as the examples of excellence, suggest the need for separate student and faculty information that spells out the procedures and each group's rights and responsibilities.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of 35 sets of guidelines and 42 questionnaires from AAU institutions suggests that the creation or revision of academic integrity policies and procedures could be organized as a decision-tree model. Hence the data are presented under headings that are questions, and they follow an order that corresponds to the questions that an institution would have to answer in order to build an academic integrity system. The information given under each question is the range of methods used by the AAU institutions that responded to the request for information.

In reading the guidelines, it became clear that the philosophies of the various institutions are encoded in their academic policies and procedures. Honor Code institutions maintain the attitude that the students have willingly joined an academic community and therefore owe that community academic integrity. The large public universities do not assume commitment on the part of the student.

Institutional views of students may also be seen in the reporting structure that they adopt for processing cases of academic dishonesty. Those institutions that report cases through an office of student affairs treat the student as a whole but isolate the faculty from the case. Usually the faculty become a witness in this structure. It is not surprising to find that the highest percentage of administrators' concern that faculty do not participate in the procedures come from such structures. On the other hand, universities that report academic dishonesty cases through the academic side of the house seem to follow the philosophy that learning is the joint responsibility of faculty and students. It is interesting to note that while fewer administrators operating within this structure expressed concern over faculty involvement, a higher percentage of such institutions recently revised or plan to revise their policies and procedures than those in the previous group. Again, one must keep in mind that the population is too small to offer statistically valid correlations. Still, a pattern may be discerned from the data available.

A few more observations from the data are given in the belief that they might aid institutions in the revision of academic integrity procedures and policies:

The entire university community -- administration, staff, faculty, and students -- has a stake in academic integrity. Academic integrity procedures enforce respect for the community, the ideals of the institution, the consideration of peers and colleagues. Violations hurt the reputation of the institution. Violations of integrity hurt students when they are graded on a curve, thus stealing others' place in the class. Violations hurt faculty because ethics and authority in the classroom are challenged. Because faculty, students, and administrators are affected by violations of academic integrity, all three groups should be involved in publicizing and enforcing proper conduct.

It appears that the reason why faculty do not use the academic integrity system as frequently as the administrators and honest students would prefer is that faculty rights and protections are not delineated as students rights and protections are.

Some procedures are so cumbersome and time-consuming that the student might lose the whole semester in all classes because s/he is preparing a defense and worrying about one class.

The desire to be absolutely fair to the student often results in excessive paperwork, occupying hours of time for faculty, students, committees, and staff.

Most guidelines on academic integrity sound like legal treatises. Yet students -- especially freshmen -- are expected to read them.

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITIES USED IN REPORT

Brandeis University
Carnegie Mellon University
Case Western Reserve University
Catholic University of America
Clark University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
Harvard University
Indiana University, Bloomington
Iowa State University of Science & Technology
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Michigan State University
New York University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Pennsylvania State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Rice University
Stanford University
Tulane University
University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
University of Chicago
University of Florida, Gainesville
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champagne
University of Iowa, Iowa City
University of Kansas, Lawrence
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
University of N. Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of Oregon, Eugene
University of Pennsylvania
University of Southern California
University of Texas, Austin
University of Virginia, Charlottesville
University of Wisconsin, Madison
Vanderbilt University
Washington University, St. Louis
Yale University

APPENDIX B

Academic Integrity Survey
University of Pittsburgh

Please check all appropriate responses

	Yes	No	No Response[8]
1. Does your institution have written academic integrity procedures for undergraduate students?	42	0	0
2. Are your academic integrity procedures supported by a student honor code?	10*	29	3
3. Do the procedures apply to the total undergraduate student population or does each school or college have separate regulations?	31	7	4
4. Has the university revised the academic integrity procedures within the last academic year?	10	31	1
5. Is the university planning to revise the procedures in the coming year?	6	33	3
6. Who participates in the development or revision of the academic integrity procedures?			
a) The trustees	8	17	17
b) The president	15	14	13
c) The provost or academic vice president	25	7	10
d) Academic administrators	34	4	4
e) Other administrators	30	2	10
f) University legal staff	29	3	10
g) Faculty	38	2	2
h) Students	38	1	3

* Respondents self-identified as having an Honor Code

[8] 'No Response' category includes respondents who checked off both "Yes" and "No" answers, checked in-between answers, or checked neither

	Yes	No	No Response
7. Files on the individual cases are			
a. Destroyed when the student leaves the university	13	23	6
b. Kept for _____ years (please fill in)	1 - 15 years		
c. Shared within the university when necessary	32	8	2
d. Confidential within a school or department	23	13	6

8. During the past year, how many complaints were filed, but not reviewed by a hearing board? 0 - 360 (mean = 34.2)

9. During the past year, how many academic integrity cases were reviewed by a hearing board? 0 - 183 (mean = 25.5)

10. Are your academic integrity procedures working effectively?	34	0	8

11. If you could modify your academic integrity procedures, what would you change?

TOTAL SURVEYS RECEIVED 42

File: Report.7
February 16, 1989